

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Interview held on September 15, 2005 and for agreeing that the Office Action mailed July 12, 2005 fails to address certain features of the independent claims and that col. 37, line 59 to col. 38, line 3 of Rossmann does not disclose or suggest these features. Applicants further thank the Examiner for agreeing to call Applicants' undersigned representative, Kelly T. Lee, at (202) 662-2736 for further understanding of the remarks and before issuing a further Office Action.

Claims 1-20 are pending. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claims 1 and 18 are amended to recite that the claimed method is implemented on a computer system, which is directed to statutory subject matter within §101. See In re Lowry, 32 F.2d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,809,415 to Rossmann (hereafter Rossmann) in view of U.S. Patent 6,148,323 to Whitner et al. (hereafter Whitner) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,141,665 to Hara et al. (hereafter Hara). The Office Action asserts on page 4 that Rossmann teaches "wherein the user is authorized to run the requested tool only if the user is assigned with the role containing the request tool (col. 37, line 59-col. 38, line 3)." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rossmann is directed to a method and architecture for an interactive two-way data communication network. Whitner is directed to a system and method for managing the execution of system management using a task manager. Hara is directed to a model-based job supporting system and method.

As agreed upon during the Interview, the Office Action fails to address the feature: "wherein the user is authorized to run the requested tool only if the user is assigned with the role containing the requested tool on all of the nodes," as recited in claim 1. As also agreed upon during the Interview, Rossmann does not disclose or suggest, at col. 37, line 59 to col. 38, line 3, the above feature. This "all or none" authorization model is described, for example, on page 10, lines 15-20 of the present application. None of the references disclose

or suggest this feature. Since Rossmann, Whitner, and Hara, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-14 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 15, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Rossmann and Whitner, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "wherein the user is authorized to run the requested tool only if the user is assigned with the role containing the requested tool on all of the nodes," as recited in amended claim 15 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16-17 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 15 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 18, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Rossmann and Whitner, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "wherein the user is authorized to run the requested tool only if the user is assigned with the role containing the requested tool on all of the nodes," as recited in amended claim 18 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 18 is allowable.

Claims 19-20 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 18 and for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739

Date: **October 12, 2005**